

Dust - Radiation Universes: Stability Analysis

MARCO BRUNI*

School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary and Westfield College, London U.K.

Dipartimento di Astronomia, Università di Trieste, Italy.

KAMILLA PIOTRKOWSKA

S.I.S.S.A. - I.S.A.S. via Beirut 2/4 Trieste, Italy

February 1, 2008

Abstract

In this paper we consider flat and open universe models containing a mixture of cold matter (dust) and radiation interacting only through gravity, with the aim of studying their stability with respect to linear scalar perturbations. To this end we consider the perturbed universe as a dynamical system, described by coupled differential equations for a gauge-invariant perturbation variable and a relevant background variable.

The phase-space analysis of this dynamical system shows that flat dust-radiation models are unstable, and open models structurally unstable, with respect to adiabatic perturbations. For flat models, there are actually three different regimes of evolution for the perturbations, depending on their wavelength and the transition scale from one regime to the other is determined by a critical wavenumber for the perturbations, k_{EC} (an invariant of the model). We find that $k_{EC} < k_{JE}$ (the Jeans wavenumber at equidensity of matter and radiation), implying that there are perturbations which decay even if their wavelength at equidensity is larger than the corresponding Jeans scale. We also briefly discuss metric and curvature perturbations.

We believe that this analysis gives a clearer idea of the stability properties of realistic universe models than the standard one based on the Jeans scale, despite our simplifying assumptions.

*Present address: School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary and Westfield College, Mile End Road E1 4NS, London, U.K.

Ref. SISSA 126/93/A (July 30,1993)

Feb. 90

1 Introduction

A main goal of present - day cosmology is to understand the formation of the structures (galaxies, clusters, superclusters) observed in the universe, while trying to explain why, on large enough scales, this seems to be so well described by the Friedmann - Lemaître - Robertson - Walker (FLRW hereafter) isotropic models. Given these latter, most theories of structure formation are based on the gravitational instability scenario. At any given epoch, there are perturbations larger than a certain characteristic - time dependent - scale¹; while perturbations much smaller than this scale oscillate as sound waves, the larger density perturbations grow, eventually entering a non - linear regime during the matter dominated epoch, thus forming the observed structures. The mathematical basis for such scenario is the theory of perturbations of FLRW models.

In the inflationary scenario, the perturbations were generated from quantum fluctuations within the Hubble horizon H^{-1} , have evolved classically outside the horizon, and have re-entered it during the radiation or matter dominated epochs (perturbations with larger wavelength re-entering later). During the last decade, observations of the distribution of matter have shown that the scale at which the background homogeneity is reached is larger than what was thought before, being of the order of hundreds of Mpc². Consequently, both the inflationary scenario and the large scale observations motivate the use of a fully relativistic theory of perturbations in FLRW models in order to study the formations of the larger structures.³

For the latter ones, the density contrast against the homogeneous background appears to be small enough that a linear perturbation analysis still suffice to describe the evolution of perturbations of the corresponding scale. Even if the density contrast is mildly non - linear, the curvature perturbations are still in the linear regime [3], [13], thus one can imagine the present universe as well described by a linearly perturbed FLRW model at large scales, while non - linearities at smaller scales can be considered smoothed out in this picture.⁴ Then the question arises if in this respect we live in a special epoch - an epoch in which large scale perturbations are still in the linear regime - or if this is a natural output in the theoretical context of perturbed FLRW models. This question is of the same sort as that posed by the "flatness problem": if the geometry of the universe

¹This can be the Jeans scale, or the Hubble radius sometimes loosely referred to as horizon; a more important scale is actually the sound horizon, see [2].

²The answer to the question "At which scale in the universe there is a transition to homogeneity?" depends on how the question is posed, i.e. how such a scale is defined. In a very loose sense we can say that this scale is measured by the size of the largest structures we see (of the order of 10^2 Mpc), and in a strict sense such a scale does not exist at all if there is not a cut-off in the perturbation spectrum. Various reasonable definitions of such a scale can be given (e.g. specifying a level for the fluctuations, such that we can say that there is a transition to homogeneity at the scale where the fluctuations fall below the specified threshold): see for examples [26] and [10].

³Newtonian perturbation theory being applicable only for vanishing pressure and at scales much smaller than the horizon.

⁴In general, this raises the issue of defining a proper averaging procedure, here we do not address this problem; see e.g. [14] or [18].

is non-flat, then we live in a special epoch in which the density parameter is still close to unity $\Omega_o \sim 1$. It is well known that in a flat dust model there is a perturbation mode that grows unbounded, while in an open dust universe there is a mode that freezes in at an epoch $z \approx \Omega^{-1}$. In both cases the perturbation equation (1) is the same for all modes, because for $c_s^2 = w = 0$ (dust) the coefficient β (23) does not depend on the wavenumber k . It is usually said that in a dust universe each perturbation evolves as a separate FLRW universe. On the other hand, perturbation scales in a pure radiation model always come within the "sound horizon" (see [2]) and oscillate as sound waves.

This simple picture gives however rather little information about the generality of this behaviour for the perturbations, and on the stability properties of the perturbed FLRW model.

The aim of this paper is therefore to study the problem of the stability of FLRW models following an alternative approach: instead of looking for analytic solutions (either exact or approximate, see e.g. [25]) of the perturbation equations, we consider the perturbed universe as a dynamical system, described by coupled differential equations for a gauge-invariant perturbation variable and a relevant background variable. In this approach, the evolution of perturbations is represented by the trajectories in the phase space of the dynamical system, and their final fate is linked to the presence and the nature of the critical points of the system.

In a certain sense the present work extends that of [9] to include perturbations, although we restrict our analysis to open and flat models only, and we take a vanishing cosmological constant $\Lambda = 0$. Previous works have followed the approach to stability used here [28], [4], but they only considered either a pure radiation or a pure dust model. However, since the analysis here is based on the study of the dynamical system at time-infinity, the pure radiation model does not appear physically significant in this limit, while the stability properties of the dust models are affected by the simplifying assumption of the vanishing of the speed of sound in these models. Therefore here we consider a class of perturbed models containing both dust and radiation as a more realistic description of the real universe. The dust component can be taken to represent Cold Dark Matter (massive weakly interacting particles), while the radiation component represents photons and other massless particles such as massless neutrinos. Therefore these two fluids interact only through gravity.

Since our aim is to study the stability properties of these simple models, we consider only the total density perturbation (the single component perturbations are not directly relevant to the evolution of curvature perturbations), assuming adiabatic perturbations.

For the case of flat universe models we find that there exists a critical wavenumber k_{EC} , which is an invariant characteristic of the model and is related to the only scale entering the flat models, i.e. the Hubble radius at equidensity of matter and radiation H_E^{-1} . The corresponding critical scale λ_{EC} (λ_E is the perturbation wavelength at equidensity), remarks the transition from stability to instability, but in a way which is more rigorous - from the point of view of the stability analysis - than the Jeans or the Hubble scale. We find that there are actually three regimes for the evolution of fluctuations:

1. growing large scale perturbations (unstable modes)
2. overdamped intermediate scale perturbations
3. damped small scale wave perturbations,

where the transition scale from one regime to another is always of the order of λ_{EC} , and for this latter, separating cases 1. and 2., we find that the perturbed FLRW models are *structurally unstable* [1]. Also, we show that λ_{EC} is of the order of the Jeans scale λ_{JE} at equidensity in the same model: however since $\lambda_{EC} \simeq 2.2\lambda_{JE}$ (today $\lambda_{0C} \simeq 67Mpc$), our analysis shows that there are perturbation modes that decay, despite that their scale λ_E is larger than λ_{JE} at equidensity. Thus the evolution of perturbations in these models depends on their scale, in such a way that smaller scales evolve like in a pure radiation model (case 3.) and larger scales like in a pure dust model (case 1.), while we found a small intermediate range of scales (case 2.) for which perturbations are overdamped (critical damping occurs for the transition scale between cases 2. and 3.), which is an original feature of the dust–radiation models, and to our knowledge was not known before.

For the case of an open dust–radiation model instead, the evolution of perturbations appears to be dominated by the curvature of the background, and their final state is similar to that they have in a pure dust model, i.e. all the perturbation scales are frozen in to a constant value. These models are *structurally unstable* [1] with respect to perturbations of any wavelength.

The plan of the paper is as follows: in section 2 we give a brief outline of the method used here to study the stability of FLRW models; in section 3 we briefly describe the dust - radiation models and we specify the perturbation equations for them; in section 4 we describe our results and we compare them with the Jeans stability analysis, also we briefly discuss metric and curvature perturbations. Finally, in section 5 we give a summary and discuss other possible applications of the method used here.

In the following we take $c = 1$, and $\kappa = 8\pi G$ (G is the gravitational constant), and we assume a vanishing cosmological constant $\Lambda = 0$.

2 The dynamical system

In a recent series of papers, Woszczyna and colleagues considered the dynamics of Newtonian [30] and relativistic [28] linearly perturbed universe models, studying the stability of these dynamical systems. The analysis of the relativistic case was however affected by a wrong assumption on the allowed range for a scale parameter k (q in [28] and in [4]) and by a misinterpretation of the perturbation variables, as it was shown in [4].

In this article, we shall focus on relativistic perturbations of flat and open FLRW models containing two uncouple fluids coupled only through gravity: dust and radiation. Open and flat FLRW models expand for an infinite amount of time and therefore one can apply standard stability criteria: in particular one can establish if a cosmic dynamical

system, i.e. a perturbed cosmological model, is able or not to return to the original homogeneous state (in the latter case we have an instability in the sense of Liapunov and the system is said to be structurally unstable [1]) or if the perturbations grow indefinitely (instability in the Laplace sense).

In general, in the gauge - invariant approach to cosmological perturbations the scalar⁵ density perturbation variable (we shall consider specific perturbation measures later) satisfy a second order (in some time variable) differential equation. If one restricts the attention to the harmonic component X of the perturbation, and assumes that this is adiabatic (see section 3.2), its evolution is given by a homogeneous ordinary differential equation

$$\ddot{X} + \alpha(t)\dot{X} + \beta(t)X = 0, \quad (1)$$

where t here is proper time, and the dot indicates a derivative with respect to t . When it is not possible to find a simple solution to (1), a qualitative analysis of its properties is useful in order to determine the late - time behaviour of the perturbations⁶. The coefficients α and β are functions given by the background dynamics, but in general their time dependence cannot be explicitly determined. Therefore, it is useful to think of α and β as known functions of one or more parameters, and add to (1) the evolution equation for the parameters in order to have an autonomous system. A sensible choice followed in [28] is given by the density parameter Ω , which in a FLRW model satisfies the equation

$$\dot{\Omega} = \Omega(\Omega - 1)(\frac{1}{3} + w)\Theta, \quad (2)$$

where $\Theta = 3H = 3\dot{a}/a$ is the expansion of the cosmic fluid, a is the FLRW scale factor, H is the Hubble parameter, and $w = p/\mu$ is the ratio of the pressure to the energy density. It is useful to change the independent variable from the proper time t to a function of the scale factor a ; with the choice of⁷ $\tau = \ln a^3$, ($\frac{d\tau}{dt} = \Theta$) equations (1) and (2) give

$$X'' + \psi X' + \xi X = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\Omega' = \Omega(\Omega - 1)(\frac{1}{3} + w), \quad (4)$$

and in general

$$w' = -(1 + w) [c_s^2(w) - w] \quad (5)$$

⁵It is standard to call scalar perturbations those related with density perturbations describing the clumping of matter (see e.g. [27]). In this paper we shall consider only these perturbations, as the only relevant to the problem of stability of the universe.

⁶One can obviously find numerical solutions, but the study of the phase space allows us to obtain general conclusions for a generic set of initial conditions.

⁷There are various typos in [28]: there, the power appearing here in the definition of τ is missed in equation (3), and consequently a factor 1/3 is missed in equation (9).

gives the evolution of w , and in the previous equations the prime refers to the derivative with respect to $\tau = \ln a^3$.

In a single fluid FLRW model the dynamics is fixed by an equation of state $p = w\mu$, with $w = \text{const}$ (e.g. $w = 0$ dust, $w = 1/3$ radiation), and in this case $c_s^2 = \dot{p}/\dot{\mu}$ is the speed of sound, and $c_s^2 = w$. In dealing with two or more fluids however, $w' \neq 0$, and $c_s^2 \neq w$ is no longer the speed of sound unless the fluids are coupled, and ψ and ξ are given by

$$\psi(w, \Omega) = \frac{\dot{\Theta}}{\Theta^2} + \frac{1}{\Theta}\alpha(w, \Omega) = -\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{6}(1 + 3w)\Omega + \frac{1}{\Theta}\alpha(w, \Omega) , \quad (6)$$

$$\xi(w, \Omega) = \frac{1}{\Theta^2}\beta(w, \Omega) , \quad (7)$$

while the second step in (6) is given by the Raychaudhuri equation ($\kappa = 8\pi G$)

$$\dot{\Theta} + \frac{1}{3}\Theta^2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\mu(1 + 3w) = 0 , \quad (8)$$

governing the evolution of Θ (see e.g. [8]). In the simplest case of one single fluid [28], [4] with $w = \text{const}$ we have a third order autonomous system, given by (3) and (4) (or a corresponding pair of first order equations); also, equation (4) forms an autonomous first order subsystem in this case. In the most general case we have a fourth order autonomous system, with (5) as autonomous subsystem (as we shall see in section 3.1, $c_s^2 = c_s^2(w)$ is fixed once the fluid components are specified). The order of the system can however be reduced: first, it turns out that in the practical case (see section 3.1) either w or Ω can be eliminated; second, here we are not really interested in the evolution-law of X , but rather in its qualitative behavior. Because of this, we can achieve a further dimensional reduction of the phase space passing to the Riccati equation corresponding to (3). Introducing $Y = X'$ and

$$\mathcal{U} = Y/X = X'/X , \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \sqrt{X^2 + Y^2} , \quad (10)$$

we pass in the new phase space $\{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U}, w, \Omega\}$, where

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}'}{\mathcal{R}} = \frac{\mathcal{U}(1 - \xi - \psi\mathcal{U})}{\mathcal{U}^2 + 1} , \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{U}' = -\mathcal{U}^2 - \psi\mathcal{U} - \xi , \quad (12)$$

while the evolution of Ω and w is still given by (4) and (5). The variable $\mathcal{R}$ represent an “amplitude” of the perturbation and it is not directly relevant to the present analysis. Since (12) and (4), (5) form an autonomous subsystem, one can restrict the analysis to the phase space $\{\mathcal{U}, w, \Omega\}$; moreover, as we said above, in practical cases we can restrict our attention either to $\{\mathcal{U}, w\}$ or to $\{\mathcal{U}, \Omega\}$. The relevant variable here is $\mathcal{U}$: when it is

positive we have either a growing density enhancement or an increasing energy deficit, while $\mathcal{U} < 0$ indicates that the inhomogeneity is decreasing (note that from its definition (9) $\mathcal{U}$ is a tangent in the original phase space $\{X, Y\}$, thus $-\infty < \mathcal{U} < \infty$). One is therefore interested in the nature of the critical points (if any) on the $\Omega = 0$ or the $w = 0$ axis (the final state of the cosmological dynamical system): a stable node on the $\mathcal{U} > 0$ semi-axis will indicate that the given perturbation mode will indefinitely grow, thus giving a Laplace instability; a stable node on the $\mathcal{U} < 0$ semi-axis will indicate that the given perturbation mode will finally decay, i.e. the system is stable with respect to that perturbation; a stable node on $\mathcal{U} = 0$ means that the perturbation will asymptotically approach a constant value, i.e. the system is Liapunov unstable, but still stable in the sense of Laplace (structural instability [1]). Finally, if there are no critical points on the $\Omega = 0$ (or the $w = 0$) axis, the perturbation maintains a sound wave character at any time.

A discussion of the system (12) (4) can be found in [28] (and reference therein); a discussion of the flaws of the application of the analysis given in [28] to the perturbation equations of Bardeen [2] and Ellis - Bruni [11], [12], [5] (see also [29]) is given in [4].

3 Dynamics of the dust - radiation models

We shall now apply the general method outlined in the previous section to the case of uncouple dust and radiation. In the following, we shall normalize the scale factor at equidensity of dust and radiation, introducing $S = a/a_E$. An analysis of the phase-space of FLRW models containing dust and radiation has been recently given in [9] (see also [17] and [25]); here we simply review well known results, that are needed for the perturbation analysis, with emphasis on a useful parameterization.

3.1 The background

Since the two fluids are uncoupled, we have separate energy conservation, with $\mu_d = \frac{1}{2}\mu_E S^{-3}$ and $\mu_r = \frac{1}{2}\mu_E S^{-4}$, where μ_E is the *total* energy density at equidensity. Then the total energy density $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\mu_E(S^{-3} + S^{-4})$ is also conserved, while the total pressure is that of the radiation component, $p = p_r = \frac{1}{3}\mu_r = \frac{1}{6}\mu_E S^{-4}$; therefore

$$w = \frac{1}{3(S+1)} . \quad (13)$$

For two non interacting fluids the quantity $c_s^2 = \frac{\dot{p}}{\dot{\mu}}$ is only formally the speed of sound: for dust and radiation we have

$$c_s^2 = \frac{4}{3(4+3S)} . \quad (14)$$

At equidensity $S = 1$, $w = 1/6$, and $c_s^2 = 4/21$. Clearly, (13) can be inverted to give

$$S = \frac{1-3w}{3w} , \quad (15)$$

and then the expansion of the universe model we consider is parameterized by w , with w ($1/3 \geq w \geq 0$) varying from a pure radiation dominated ($t \rightarrow 0$) to a pure matter dominated ($t \rightarrow \infty$) phase.

Note that (13), with (14), is in practice an integral for (5); also, given (13) we can integrate (2):

$$\Omega = \frac{\Omega_E(S+1)}{\Omega_E(S+1) + 2(1-\Omega_E)S^2} ; \quad (16)$$

since today $S_0 = a_0/a_E = 1 + z_E \gg 1$, the density parameter at equidensity is $\Omega_E \simeq \left(1 + \frac{(1-\Omega_0)}{2S_0\Omega_0}\right)^{-1}$. Clearly, equation (16) can also be inverted to parameterize the expanding model with Ω . However in the following we shall find convenient the parameterization in w , which will allow us to give a unified treatment of flat and open models: from (15) and (14) we have

$$c_s^2 = \frac{4w}{3(1+w)} , \quad (17)$$

and this with (5) give

$$w' = w \left(w - \frac{1}{3} \right) , \quad (18)$$

where hereafter the prime stands for the derivative with respect to $\tau = \ln S^3$.

From (18) and (4) we get

$$\Omega = \frac{3\Omega_E w}{3\Omega_E w + 2(1-\Omega_E)(1-3w)^2} , \quad (19)$$

which can be used in expressions for ξ and ψ to obtain these coefficients as functions of w only, thus reducing the effective phase space needed for the stability analysis to $\{\mathcal{U}, w\}$, i.e. that of the plane autonomous system (12), (18). We note also that the system (18), (4), that describes the evolution of the background universe model is a plane autonomous subsystem in the full space $\{\mathcal{U}, \Omega, w\}$: this will always be a property of a dynamical system describing a perturbed universe, since the basic assumption of the perturbation analysis is that of neglecting the backreaction of the perturbations on the dynamics of the background model.

Finally, for completeness, we note that also the total energy density is given by

$$\mu = \frac{27}{2} \mu_E \frac{w^3}{(1-3w)^4} . \quad (20)$$

This obviously also follows from the conservation equation $\mu' = -\mu(1+w)$, integrated using (18); and $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ as $w \rightarrow 1/3$, $\mu \rightarrow 0$ as $w \rightarrow 0$.

3.2 The perturbed model

We shall now consider the dynamics of the perturbed dust-radiation models.

First, we have to specify a perturbation measure X , i.e. the variable appearing in (1) and (3). Here, we shall focus on density perturbations, and we shall take $\Delta =$

$a^2({}^{(3)}\nabla^2\mu)/\mu$ as our fundamental variable, as was originally defined in [12] (see also [29]) following the covariant approach to perturbation introduced in [11].

This covariant quantity is an exact measure of density inhomogeneity, it is scalar and locally defined. With respect to a FLRW background Δ is a gauge-invariant variable that, once expanded at first order in the perturbations, is proportional to the Bardeen variable ε_m (see [5]); thus its components with respect to an orthonormal set of scalar harmonic functions are proportional to the density perturbation in the comoving gauge (see [2]; for a comprehensive treatment of perturbations in this gauge see [21]).

In the following, we shall restrict our attention to the harmonic components of Δ , where the scalar harmonics Q are defined by

$${}^{(3)}\nabla^2 Q = -\frac{k^2}{a^2} Q, \quad (21)$$

${}^{(3)}\nabla^2$ is the Laplace operator in the 3-surface of constant curvature and $k \geq 0$ for $K = 0$, but $k \geq 1$ for $K = -1$ [16], [22]. Thus in the flat case the wavenumber k is simply related to the physical scale of the perturbation i.e. its wavelength $\lambda = 2\pi a/k$, but this is not the case for the open models. However k can always be taken as invariantly characterizing the scale of the perturbation, and we shall do so.

Since the harmonic component $\Delta^{(k)}$ of Δ and ε_m are just proportional [5], in the following the perturbation measure X appearing in (1) and (3) can be identified either with $\Delta^{(k)}$ or with ε_m .

In the case of a mixture of dust and radiation, in general the evolution equation for X is coupled to the evolution equation for an entropy perturbation variable (see [19]; [8]; [23] and also [25]). However the coupling is important only at small scales: here we shall only focus on perturbations at scales of the order of or larger than the Hubble radius H_E^{-1} at equidensity, thus we shall restrict to purely adiabatic modes, i.e. solutions of (1), neglecting the coupling with the entropy perturbation.

In general the coefficients α and β in (1) are given by (see [12]; [5]; [25])

$$\alpha = (2 + 3c_s^2 - 6w)H, \quad (22)$$

$$\beta = -\left[\left(\frac{1}{2} + 4w - \frac{3}{2}w^2 - 3c_s^2\right)\kappa\mu + 12(c_s^2 - w)\frac{K}{a^2}\right] + c_s^2\frac{k^2}{a^2}; \quad (23)$$

using (17) for the dust-radiation background we get

$$\alpha = 2\frac{(1 - 3w^2)}{(1 + w)}H, \quad (24)$$

$$\beta = -\left[\frac{3}{2}\left(1 + \frac{w^2(5 - 3w)}{(1 + w)}\right)\Omega H^2 + 4\frac{w(1 - 3w)}{(1 + w)}\frac{K}{a^2}\right] + \frac{4w}{3(1 + w)}\frac{k^2}{a^2}. \quad (25)$$

From this, we obtain

$$\psi(w, \Omega) = \frac{1}{6}(1 + 3w)(1 - \Omega) + \frac{1 - 6w - 15w^2}{6(1 + w)}, \quad (26)$$

$$\xi(w, \Omega) = -\frac{1}{6} \left(1 + \frac{w^2(5 - 3w)}{1 + w} \right) \Omega + \frac{4w(1 - 3w)}{9(1 + w)}(1 - \Omega) + \Xi_K(w, k), \quad (27)$$

where $\Xi_K(w, k) = \frac{4w}{27(1+w)} \frac{k^2}{a^2 H^2}$ is a function that takes a different form, as function of w , depending on the curvature K : in an open universe $a^2 H^2 = (1 - \Omega)^{-1}$, but in the flat case we cannot use the Friedmann equation to substitute for $a^2 H^2$. Rather, we use it to substitute for $3H^2 = \kappa\mu$, and μ is given by (20), while here $a = Sa_E$ and S is given by (15). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} K = 0 \quad \Xi &= \frac{(1-3w)^2}{1+w} \Xi_0 k^2, & \Xi_0 &= \frac{8}{81a_E^2 H_E^2}, \\ K = -1 \quad \Xi &= \frac{4w}{27(1+w)} (1 - \Omega) k^2, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $3H_E^2 = \kappa\mu_E$, and for open models we can substitute for $\Omega = \Omega(w)$ from (19) in all the previous expressions. It is clear from (28) that in the space $\{\mathcal{U}, w, \Omega\}$ the function Ξ_K is not continuous (for $k \neq 0$) on the plane $\Omega = 1$, except on the line $w = 1/3, \Omega = 1$; this discontinuity of Ξ_K will play an important role in the behaviour of perturbations.

4 Results

We shall now summarize the results we obtained from the analysis of the dynamical system given by (12), (18) and (4), with coefficients ψ and ξ given by (26) and (27), first restricting to the flat models and then considering the open ones.

4.1 The flat models

The flat perturbed models are described by the subsystem (12), (18) substituting $\Omega = 1$ in ψ (26) and ξ (27) and using Ξ for $K = 0$ given in (28). From this latter we see that for flat models there is a characteristic scale that, as we shall see, is related to the late time behaviour of the perturbations: this is the Hubble radius at equidensity H_E^{-1} . It is therefore convenient to define

$$k_E = \frac{k}{a_E H_E} = 2\pi \frac{H_E^{-1}}{\lambda_E}, \quad (29)$$

which represents a wavenumber normalized at equidensity: $k_E = 2\pi \Leftrightarrow \lambda_E = H_E^{-1}$ i.e. $k_E = 2\pi$ corresponds to a perturbation wavelength that enters the horizon at equivalence epoch.

Stationary points eventually exist on the $w = 1/3$ and $w = 0$ axis, with

$$\mathcal{U}_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(-\psi_w \pm \sqrt{\psi_w^2 - 4\xi_w}), \quad (30)$$

POINT I: UNSTABLE NODE $w = 1/3, \mathcal{U}_- = -\frac{1}{3}$	POINT II: SADDLE $w = 1/3, \mathcal{U}_+ = \frac{2}{3}$
$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = 1$ $\lambda_w = \frac{1}{3}$	$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = -1$ $\lambda_w = \frac{1}{3}$
POINT III: SADDLE $w = 0, \mathcal{U}_- = -\frac{1}{12} - \lambda_{\mathcal{U}}$	POINT IV: STABLE NODE $w = 0, \mathcal{U}_+ = -\frac{1}{12} - \lambda_{\mathcal{U}}$
$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{25}{24} - \frac{k_E^2}{k_{EC}^2} \right)}$ $\lambda_w = -\frac{1}{3}$	$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{25}{24} - \frac{k_E^2}{k_{EC}^2} \right)}$ $\lambda_w = -\frac{1}{3}$

Table 1: Flat models: the four stationary points with the corresponding eigenvalues along the axis $\mathcal{U}$ and w and their nature; Point III and IV exist only for $k_E \leq \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}k_{EC}$.

where ψ_w, ξ_w (with $w = 0, 1/3$) correspond to the stationary values of ψ and ξ .

The stationary points for the system (12), (18) are given in Table 1.

As we have explained at the end of section 2, the condition for having growing perturbations is given by the appearance of a stable node on the positive side of the $\mathcal{U}$ axis. From (30) we see that we need $\xi_0 \leq 0$ in order to have $\mathcal{U}_+ \geq 0$, i.e.

$$k_E \leq k_{EC}, \quad k_{EC} = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{4}. \quad (31)$$

Moreover, stationary points only exist for $\psi_w^2 - 4\xi_w \geq 0$, which is always satisfied only for $w = 1/3$. For $w = 0$ we have $\psi_0^2 - 4\xi_0 = \frac{2}{3}(\frac{25}{24} - k_E^2/k_{EC}^2)$, i.e. stationary points exist on this axis for perturbations of wavelength at equivalence $\lambda_E \geq \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC} < \lambda_{EC}$. We see from Table 1 that this is the same condition for the reality of the eigenvalues, a result that follows from the fact that w' does not depend on $\mathcal{U}$. From the values of these eigenvalues we have that: Point I is an unstable node, Point II is a saddle, Point III is a saddle, Point IV is a stable node.

When for this latter we have $\mathcal{U}_+ > 0$, i.e. for k_E smaller than the *critical* wavenumber k_{EC} , generic perturbations with physical wavelength $\lambda_E > \lambda_{EC}$ *grow unbounded*, with the critical perturbation scale λ_{EC} corresponding to k_{EC} in (31), given by $\lambda_{EC} = \frac{8\pi}{3\sqrt{3}}H_E^{-1}$, i.e. $\lambda_{EC} > H_E^{-1}$: this situation is illustrated in Fig. 1. Note in this figure the special *saddle trajectories*: the one ending in $\mathcal{U}_-$ represents the purely decaying mode, while the other (ending in $\mathcal{U}_+$ as the generic trajectory) represents the purely growing mode (the attractor); the generic trajectory represents a linear combination of the two modes solutions of (3). Also, we remind that the variable $\mathcal{U}$ is a tangent in the original phase space $\{X, X'\}$, so that the trajectories in the figures that start from Point I and go to the left of the saddle trajectory exit the figure on the left boundary, and re-enter it from the right ending in Point IV.

Figure 1: Flat models: phase space for the evolution of large scales $\lambda_E > \lambda_{EC}$ that grow unbounded ($\mathcal{U}_+ > 0$).

Figure 2: Flat models: phase space for the evolution of the damped waves on small scales ($\mathcal{U}_\pm \in \mathfrak{F}$).

Figure 3: Flat models: phase space for the overdamped modes ($\mathcal{U}_+ < 0$) on intermediate scales $\frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC} < \lambda_E < \lambda_{EC}$.

Clearly, when Point IV does not exist, i.e. for perturbations with wavelength at equivalence $\lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$, we are considering perturbations that always *oscillate* as “sound waves” (see Fig. 2); we have checked through a direct stability analysis of the system (37) below (see section 4.4) that the amplitude of these modes decay. Again, trajectories that exit from the left re-enter from the right: for $\lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$ however this happens many times, and indeed it is this that characterizes the oscillatory behaviour of these modes in the $\{\mathcal{U}, w\}$ plane.

Also, for scales $k_{EC} < k_E < \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}k_{EC}$ we have $\mathcal{U}_+ < 0$ for Point IV, i.e. the stable node is located on the negative side of the $\mathcal{U}$ axis: thus perturbation scales in this range are overdamped: they decay without oscillating, as it appears from Fig. 3. Again, the saddle trajectories represent the two modes for (3), and the trajectories going out from the left of Fig. 3 re-enter from the right, ending in Point IV.

Finally, we point out that for $k_E = \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}k_{EC}$ the two stationary points on the $\mathcal{U}$ axis (the saddle and the stable node in the second line of Table 1) coincide, i.e. this is a *fold bifurcation point* (see e.g. [1]). The corresponding scale $\lambda_E = \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC} = \frac{16\sqrt{2}}{15}\pi H_E^{-1} \simeq 4.7H_E^{-1}$ is quite larger than the Hubble radius at equidensity; thus we can consider scales $\lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$, as in Fig. 2, such that still $\lambda_E > H_E^{-1}$: this partially justifies our assumption of purely adiabatic perturbations (cf. [24]).

Thus we have three different evolution regimes for the adiabatic perturbation modes of a mixture of uncouple dust and radiation in a flat universe, depending on their wavelength:

1. large scale perturbations that grow unbounded, giving instability
2. intermediate scale perturbations that are overdamped, i.e. decaying without oscillating

INSTABILITY	STABILITY	
$\lambda > \lambda_{EC}$ grow unbounded	$\frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC} < \lambda_E < \lambda_{EC}$ critical damping	$\lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$ damped waves

Table 2: Flat models: summary of the three different evolution regimes for different perturbation wavelengths.

3. small scale damped perturbations which oscillate like sound waves while their amplitude decays,

as summarized in Table 2.

4.2 The open models

The open models are in principle described by the full 3-dimensional system given by (12), (18) and (4), with trajectories in the $\{\mathcal{U}, w, \Omega\}$ space. However, given $\Omega = \Omega(w, \Omega_E)$ (19), we can substitute for Ω in the expressions for ψ (26), ξ (27) and Ξ for $K = -1$ (28), and restrict our analysis to the 2-dimensional system (12), (18). In doing this, we are selecting one particular open model in the class parameterized by Ω_E : there is no loss of generality in doing this, as the dynamical properties of the models in this class (as specified by the stationary points in their phase space) do not depend on Ω_E , i.e. for a given wavenumber k the phase space evolution of all the models in the class is qualitatively the same. From the point of view of the geometry of the phase space $\{\mathcal{U}, w, \Omega\}$ we are looking at the trajectories in the 2-dimensional surface specified by Ω_E in this space: we shall then consider the projection of this surface with its trajectories in the $\{\mathcal{U}, w\}$ plane, as depicted in Fig. 4.

It is clear from this picture and Table 3 that, contrary to what we have seen for the flat models, the existence, position and the nature of Points I–IV do not depend on the wavenumber k , so that all open models share the same dynamical history. This depends on the vanishing of the function Ξ in the limit $w \rightarrow 0$, which also implies $\Omega \rightarrow 0$ (because we are moving on the surface specified by Ω_E). Note however that, if we do not substitute for Ω from (19) in the 3-dimensional system, and we take the limit $\Omega \rightarrow 0$, this does not give the 2-dimensional system for flat models: this fact is due to the discontinuity (remarked at the end of section 4.1) of the function Ξ on the surface $\Omega = 1$, where Ξ for $K = 0$ do not vanish in general, except for $w = 1/3$ or $k = 0$. In some way, this fact can be seen as an example of "fragility" in cosmology [6].

From table 2 and Fig. 4 we see that Point IV is a stable node located at $\mathcal{U} = 0$. The generic trajectory ends up in this point, either directly from Point I, or first going out from the left boundary of the picture and then re-entering from the right. The saddle trajectory starting from Point I and ending in Point III represents the evolution of the purely decaying mode, and the saddle trajectory starting from Point III and ending in

Figure 4: Open models: the phase space evolution is independent of the wavelength, and all perturbations tend to a constant value ($\mathcal{U}_+ = 0$).

Point IV represents the purely growing mode⁸ (attractor). The fact that Point IV is located in $\mathcal{U} = 0$ means that all the perturbation modes evolve up to a constant value, and then freeze-in. We can say that open models are Liapunov unstable (the generic perturbation modes do not decay), but Laplace stable (the perturbations do not grow unbounded), a situation that can be described as *structural instability* of the dynamical system [1].

A direct analysis of the system (37) below (section 4.4) shows indeed that the appearance of a fixed point on $\mathcal{U} = 0$ for the system (12), (18) corresponds to the vanishing of one of the eigenvalue for the corresponding fixed point in the phase space $\{X, X', w\}$. While this happens only for $k_E = k_{EC}$ in flat models, it is a generic characteristic for any k in open universes. A comparison of Fig. 4 and Fig. 1a in [4] shows that open dust-radiation models and open pure dust models share the same stability properties. It appears that the curvature of the background dominates also the evolution of the perturbations: for dust radiation models there is a conspiracy between curvature and pressure, such that curvature has an opposite effect on small and large scale: with respect to the behaviour in flat models, it avoids the oscillation of small scales perturbations ($\lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$) and damps the growth of those on large scales ($\lambda_E > \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$).

⁸The terminology *growing* and *decaying* is purely conventional: it is adopted here because it is standard in the literature to refer in this way to the two modes, as they are effectively growing and decaying e.g. in flat pure dust models. We stress again that the "growing" mode is actually growing only when $\mathcal{U}_+ > 0$.

POINT I: UNSTABLE NODE $w = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \mathcal{U}_- = -\frac{1}{3}$	POINT II: SADDLE $w = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \mathcal{U}_+ = \frac{2}{3}$
$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = 1$ $\lambda_w = \frac{1}{3}$	$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = -1$ $\lambda_w = \frac{1}{3}$
POINT III: SADDLE $w = 0, \quad \mathcal{U}_- = -\frac{1}{3}$	POINT IV: STABLE NODE $w = 0, \quad \mathcal{U}_+ = 0$
$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = \frac{1}{3}$ $\lambda_w = -\frac{1}{3}$	$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}} = -\frac{1}{3}$ $\lambda_w = -\frac{1}{3}$

Table 3: Open models: the four stationary points with the corresponding eigenvalues along the axis $\mathcal{U}$ and w and their nature.

4.3 Comparison with Jeans instability

We can apply the Jeans instability criterion directly to equation (1): this implies that gravitational collapse of a given perturbation mode will occur if $\beta < 0$, i.e. if $k < k_J$, where for the dust–radiation models β is given by (25), and the corresponding k_J is

$$\frac{k_J^2}{a^2} = \frac{3(1+w)}{4w} \left[\frac{3}{2} \left(1 + \frac{w^2(5-3w)}{1+w} \right) \Omega H^2 + \frac{4w(1-3w)}{1+w} \frac{K}{a^2} \right]. \quad (32)$$

At equidensity ($w = 1/6$) this gives

$$\frac{k_{JE}^2}{a_E^2} = \frac{279}{32} \Omega_E H_E^2 + \frac{3}{2} (\Omega_E - 1) H_E^2; \quad (33)$$

in the real universe $\Omega_E \approx 1$ and the contribution to k_{JE} from the curvature term (the last in the equation above) is completely negligible. Thus in a flat universe ($K = 0$) we have

$$\lambda_{JE} \equiv \frac{2\pi a_E}{k_{JE}} = \frac{8\pi}{3} \sqrt{\frac{2}{31}} H_E^{-1} \quad (34)$$

for the Jeans scale at equidensity. Then a comparison with the critical scale λ_{EC} defined in section 4.1 gives

$$\lambda_{JE} = \sqrt{\frac{6}{31}} \lambda_{CE}, \quad (35)$$

i.e. for flat models the stability criteria used in section 4.1 give a critical scale λ_{EC} for instability which is larger than the corresponding Jeans scale at equidensity by a factor of 2, i.e. $\lambda_{EC} \approx 2.3 \lambda_{JE}$. The fact that the values of these two scales are relatively close appears physically meaningful, and in a way obvious, since both scales are somehow defined through the same differential equation. However, a comparison of (35) with the analysis of section 4.1 shows that there are perturbations with $\lambda_E > \lambda_{JE}$ that decay:

those with wavelength $\lambda_{JE} < \lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$ are damped oscillation, while those with $\lambda_{JE} > \lambda_E > \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$ are overdamped. It is immediate to show that today the critical scale corresponding to k_{EC} is

$$\lambda_{0C} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}(1+z_E)^{-1}H_0^{-1}}, \quad (36)$$

i.e. about $67.3h^{-1}Mpc$ in a flat universe with $1+z_E \approx 4.310^{-5}h^{-2}$ (see e.g. [20]). Even if this value may be an artifact of our simplifying assumptions, e.g. the fact that we have neglected isocurvature modes at all times and we have treated radiation as a perfect fluid even at small scales, we believe that the discrepancy between our critical scale and the Jeans scale in the same universe model is a general feature that deserves further investigation in order to consider possible effects for models of structure formation in the universe.

Finally, it is interesting to consider the limit $w \rightarrow 0$ of k_J . For flat models, one gets from (32) that in this limit $k_J = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{4}a_E H_E$, i.e. we recover k_{EC} (31) in this limit. However the same limit for open models gives a value for k_J that: *a)* is real only for $\Omega_E > 16/25$, a result that, although satisfied in the real universe, appears spurious for the theory; *b)* gives the false impression that there could be growing and oscillating modes also for open models, contrary to what we have shown in the previous section.

4.4 Metric and curvature perturbations

In the previous sections we have given the results of the analysis of the dynamical system $\{\mathcal{U}, w\}$ (12), (18) for flat and open models, and inferred conclusions on the evolution of density perturbations, represented by the harmonic component X (see section 3.2). As we have already pointed out, there is a particular relation between the location and character of the critical points in the phase space $\{\mathcal{U}, w\}$, and the character of the corresponding point in the original phase space $\{X, X', w\}$ ⁹. Indeed, it is immediate that the original system ($Y \equiv X'$)

$$\begin{cases} X' &= Y \\ Y' &= -\psi Y - \xi X \\ w' &= w \left(w - \frac{1}{3} \right) \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

admits only two fixed points for $\xi \neq 0$: Point A $\equiv \{X = 0, Y = 0, w = 1/3\}$ and Point B $\equiv \{X = 0, Y = 0, w = 0\}$. Then it is easy to see that the eigenvalues at these points along the principal directions in the $\{X, Y\}$ planes equate the roots $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}$ of (12), i.e. $\lambda_{\pm} = \mathcal{U}_{\pm}$. Point A is the same for flat and open models ($\lambda_- = -1/3$, $\lambda_+ = 2/3$, $\lambda_w = 1/3$), while (27), (28) and the analysis in section 4.2 shows that for open models $\xi = 0$ for $w = 0$, and thus Point B degenerates into a line (the $Y = 0$ axis): $\lambda_+ = \mathcal{U}_+ = 0$

⁹Here we assume that, for open models, we are using the function $\Omega = \Omega(w, \Omega)$ (19), so that the further dimension Ω in the phase space is suppressed.

QUANTITY	$\lambda_E < \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}\lambda_{EC}$	$\lambda_E = \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}\lambda_{EC}$	$\lambda_{EC} > \lambda_E > \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}\lambda_{EC}$	$\lambda_E = \lambda_{EC}$	$\lambda_E \gg \lambda_{EC}$
$X_{\pm}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{4} \pm iQ}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{4} \pm P}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \text{ const.}$	$S^{-\frac{3}{2}}, S$
$\Phi_{N\pm}$	$S^{-\frac{5}{4} \pm iQ}$	$S^{-\frac{5}{4}}$	$S^{-\frac{5}{4} \pm P}$	$S^{-\frac{3}{2}}, S^{-1}$	$S^{-\frac{5}{2}}, \text{ const.}$
$E_{\pm}/\Theta^2$	$S^{-\frac{1}{4} \pm iQ}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{4} \pm P}$	$S^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \text{ const.}$	$S^{-\frac{3}{2}}, S$

Table 4: Flat models: asymptotic behaviour for $w \rightarrow 0$ (i.e. around Points III–IV) of X , Φ_N and E/Θ^2 , in order of increasing wavelengths, as function of the scale factor S ($S \sim t^{\frac{2}{3}}$ for $w \rightarrow 0$). The decaying ($-$, Point III) and growing ($+$, Point IV) modes are distinguished either by the $\pm$ or presented in order: they coincide for the critical damping scale $\lambda_E = \frac{5}{2\sqrt{6}}\lambda_{EC}$; $Q = \left[\frac{2}{3} \left(k_E^2/k_{EC}^2 - \frac{25}{24}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and $P = \left[\frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{25}{24} - k_E^2/k_{EC}^2\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

in this case, and we have *structural instability* [1]. For flat models, the same happens for $k_E = k_{EC}$, as already pointed out.

Having clarified the relation between the roots $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}$ of the system (12), (18) and the eigenvalues at the fixed points of (37), we can now turn to the asymptotic evolution of X . It is clear from the definition of $\mathcal{U} = Y/X$ that around the roots $\mathcal{U}_{\pm}$ the evolution of X is given by

$$X' = \mathcal{U}_{\pm} X, \quad \Rightarrow \quad X_{\pm} \sim S^{3\mathcal{U}_{\pm}}. \quad (38)$$

When $\mathcal{U}_{+} = 0$ we have $X_{+} = \text{const.}$ (cf. Table 3); for $w \rightarrow 0$ we recover the well known constant mode for matter dominated open models: here the same mode is found for the critical scale $k_E = k_{EC}$ in flat models.

In tables 4 and 5 we give the asymptotic behaviour for X , for a metric perturbation Φ_N and a dimensionless curvature perturbation scalar E/Θ^2 . In particular, in Table 4 we consider flat models in the limit $w \rightarrow 0$, giving the asymptotic behaviour of various variables as functions of the scale factor S and in order of increasing wavelength λ_E . In Table 5 we give the asymptotic solutions of open models around Points I–IV: as for $w \rightarrow 1/3$ the universe is radiation dominated and also $\Omega \rightarrow 1$, then $S \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in this limit, and the asymptotic solutions around Points I and II are in common with flat models. In the limit $w \rightarrow 0$ the universe models are matter dominated, and then in flat models $S \sim t^{\frac{2}{3}}$, while in open models $S \sim t$.

In the following we shall outline the relation between the gauge-invariant metric potential Φ_N , the curvature variable E , and the density perturbation Δ (see section 3.2): more details can be found in [5] and references therein. Let E_{ab} be the electric part of the Weyl tensor¹⁰ C_{acbd} : $E_{ab} \equiv C_{acbd}u^c u^d$, where u^a is the 4-velocity of matter; then to first order

$$a^{2(3)}\nabla^{b(3)}\nabla^a E_{ab} = \frac{\kappa\mu}{3}\Delta, \quad (39)$$

¹⁰Latin indices are 4-dimensional (0, 1, 2, 3), and greek indices 3-dimensional (1, 2, 3).

QUANTITY	POINT I	POINT II	POINT III	POINT IV
X	S^{-1}	S^2	S^{-1}	$const.$
Φ_N	S^{-3}	$const.$	S^{-2}	S^{-1}
$\frac{E}{\Theta^2}$	S^{-1}	S^2	S^{-2}	S^{-1}

Table 5: Open models: asymptotic behaviour around Points I–IV for X , Φ_N and E/Θ^2 , as function of the scale factor S . For $w \rightarrow 1/3$ $S \sim t^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and Point I and II are in common with flat models, while for $w \rightarrow 0$ $S \sim t$. Points I and III correspond to the decaying mode, and II and IV to the growing mode.

where $^{(3)}\nabla_a$ is a covariant derivative orthogonal to u^a . The analogue of E_{ab} in Newtonian theory is the tidal field $E_{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_{\alpha\beta}\phi$, where ϕ is the Newtonian potential and $\nabla_{\alpha\beta}\phi \equiv \nabla^2\phi - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{\alpha\beta}\phi$. Then it is possible to show that to linear order a similar formula holds in relativistic perturbation theory, i.e. $E_{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_{\alpha\beta}\Phi_N$ for the scalar part of E_{ab} (all the $\{0, 0\}$ and $\{0, \alpha\}$ components are second order). Moreover the field Φ_N , which play here the role of a gauge-invariant analogue of the Newtonian potential, is just $\Phi_N = \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_A - \Phi_H)$, where Φ_A and Φ_H are the gauge invariant metric perturbations defined in [2] ($\Phi_A = -\Phi_H$ for perfect fluids). Then using $E_{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_{\alpha\beta}\Phi_N$ in (39), the harmonic decomposition (21) and $\Delta^{(k)} = -k^2\varepsilon_m$, we get equation (4.3) of [2]:

$$2(3K - k^2)\Phi_N = \kappa a^2 \mu \varepsilon_m . \quad (40)$$

Then this relation can be used to determine the asymptotic evolution of the gauge-invariant metric potential Φ_N , and also that of amplitude $E = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{E_a{}^b E_b{}^a}$ of the tidal field E_{ab} : indeed from a comparison of (39) and (40) the harmonic components of E and Φ_N are related by

$$E = \frac{1}{2}a^{-2}k^2\Phi_N . \quad (41)$$

Then it is usual to consider a dimensionless scalar to measure the relative dynamical significance of a given field using Θ to take into account the expansion (see e.g. [15]): thus in the case of E we consider E/Θ^2 , for which we have

$$\frac{E}{\Theta^2} \sim \frac{a^{-2}\Phi_N}{\Theta^2} \sim \frac{\kappa\mu}{\Theta^2}\varepsilon_m \sim \Omega\varepsilon_m . \quad (42)$$

Hence, for example for a flat model $\Phi_N \sim const.$ for very large scales, but the relative amplitude of the tidal field $E/\Theta^2 \sim \Delta \sim a$ grows unbounded (cf. [7]).

5 Conclusions

In this paper we have considered the stability properties of FLRW models with uncouple Cold Matter (dust) and radiation. We have considered the perturbed models as dynamical systems described by an evolution equation for a gauge-invariant density perturbation

variable coupled with the equations governing the evolution of relevant background variables: the pressure–energy density ratio $w = p/\mu$ and the density parameter Ω . For the subsystem describing flat models, given by $\Omega = 1$, we deal with a planar autonomous system, and for the open models we have shown that we can also restrict the analysis to a planar system for each particular value of the density parameter at equidensity Ω_E .

The analysis of flat and open models gives different results: flat models admit unstable perturbation modes, while open models are Laplace stable (but Liapunov unstable) with respect to perturbations, irrespective of their size, ie. the perturbations freeze-in at a constant value (structural instability). Qualitatively, both results can be expected on the basis of the results of a more traditional study of the behaviour of the perturbations in simple models. The final fate of the perturbations in open models appears to be dominated by the background curvature, which governs the background expansion at late times: therefore the stability properties of the dust–radiation models are the same as those of a pure dust model, irrespective of the size of the perturbation and of the radiation content of the given model.

Instead, we find more interesting features for flat models: in this case each model has a characteristic critical invariant wavenumber k_{EC} which depends on the proportion of matter and radiation (e.g. at present), and the corresponding scale λ_{EC} determines the transition from stable to unstable modes. The scale λ_{EC} is of the order of the Hubble radius H_E^{-1} at the equidensity of matter and radiation, H_E^{-1} being the only scale entering the background model. The present value of this transition scale is $\lambda_{0C} = (1 + z_E)\lambda_{EC}$ and depends on the actual present proportion of matter and radiation, for which it is of the order of $67Mpc$. Therefore the stability properties of dust–radiation flat models are a mixture of the properties of pure dust and pure radiation models, being well known that perturbations in a flat dust models grow unbounded irrespective of their size, while all perturbation scales in a radiation model always enter an oscillatory (sound waves) regime after they enter the sound horizon (see e.g. [2]).

However, we actually find a structure in the stability properties of flat dust–radiation models which is more interesting than expected, because we find three different regimes for the evolution of the perturbations. Perturbations on scales $\lambda_E > \lambda_{EC}$ grow unbounded (unstable modes), while perturbations in the range $\frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC} < \lambda_E < \lambda_{EC}$ are overdamped; finally, perturbations on scales $\lambda_E < \frac{2\sqrt{6}}{5}\lambda_{EC}$ are damped, i.e. they oscillate as “sound waves” while decaying.

The stability properties of perturbed FLRW models that we have found should be taken *cum grano salis* with respect to the problem of structure formation in the universe, because we have assumed adiabatic perturbations at all times, neglecting isocurvature modes that are in principle important at small scales and late times, and we have neglected photon diffusion, treating radiation as a perfect fluid irrespective of the scale of the perturbation (in particular, the oscillatory behaviour of small scales in flat models is probably an artifact of this assumption). However, we believe that these assumptions should not question the validity of our main results: *a)* in a given universe model (including the assumptions about the matter content and how to treat it) there are perturbations

that decay despite the fact that their wavelength at equidensity λ_E is larger than the Jeans scale λ_{JE} ; *b*) the today size of the critical scale we have found is of the order of 67 Mpc, a fact that perhaps deserves further investigation regarding its implication for structure formation in the universe.

Finally, we remark that a comparison of the stability properties of dust–radiation models with the observed small amplitude of the large scale density fluctuations seems to suggest that if the spatial curvature of the universe vanishes, then we live in a special epoch in which these perturbations are still in a linear regime of growth, while if we live in a universe with negative spatial curvature the smallness of the large scale perturbations is a characteristic of the model at all times and the description of the universe as an open FLRW model is appropriate at any epoch.

Thus open models are special (at a given time) on average, because the density parameter Ω depends on time (this is the flatness problem), but not from the local point of view, because large scale structures are frozen-in, while the reverse is true for flat models, because $\Omega = 1$ at all times, but large scale perturbations grow unbounded in these models.

Acknowledgements

One of us (MB) is grateful to D.Arrowsmith and A.Polnarev for enlightening discussions. We thank SERC (UK) and MURST (Italy) for financial support.

References

- [1] Arrowsmith D. K., Place C. M. *An Introduction to Dynamical Systems*, (Cambridge, 1990).
- [2] Bardeen J. M., 1980. Phys. Rev. D **22**, 1882.
- [3] Barrow J. D. 1989. Quart. J. R. astr. Soc. **30** 163.
- [4] Bruni M., 1993. Phys. Rev. D **47**, 2, 738.
- [5] Bruni M., Dunsby P. K. S. & Ellis G. F. R., 1992. Astrophys. J. **395**, 34.
- [6] Coley A.A. and Tavakol R.K., 1992. Gen. Rel. and Grav. **24**, 835.
- [7] Dunsby P.K.S. 1991, Class. Quantum Grav. **8**, 1785.
- [8] Dunsby P. K. S., Bruni M. & Ellis G. F. R., 1992. Astrophys. J. **395**, 54.
- [9] Ehlers J. & Rindler W. 1989. Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc. **238**, 503.
- [10] Einasto J. & Gramann M., 1993. Astrophys. J. **407**, 443.

- [11] Ellis G. F. R. & Bruni M., 1989. Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1804.
- [12] Ellis G. F. R., Bruni M., & Hwang J., 1990. Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1035.
- [13] Fagundes H. V. & Knok S. F. 1991. Astrophys. J. **368** 337.
- [14] Futamase T., 1989, MNRAS **237**, 187.
- [15] Goode S.W., 1989 Phys. Rev. D **39**, 2882.
- [16] Harrison E. R., 1967. Rev. Mod. Phys. **39**, 862.
- [17] Harrison E. R., 1968. Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc. **140** 281.
- [18] Jacobs M.W., Linder E.V. and Wagoner R.V., 1992 Phys. Rev. D **45**, R3292.
- [19] Kodama H. and M. Sasaki, 1984. Prog. Theor. Phys. **78**, 1.
- [20] Kolb E.W. and Turner M.S., *The Early Universe*, (Addison - Wesley, 1990).
- [21] Liddle A. R. & Lyth D. H., Phys. Rep. *to appear*.
- [22] Lifshitz E. M. & Khalatnikov I. M., 1963. Adv. Phys. **12**, 185.
- [23] Lyth D. H. and Stewart E. D., 1990. Astrophys. J. **361**, 343.
- [24] Mukhanov V.F., Feldman H.A. and Brandenberger R.H., 1992 Phys. Rep. **215**, 203.
- [25] Padmanabhan T., *Structure Formation in the Universe*, (Cambridge 1993).
- [26] Scaramella R. 1992. Astrophys. J. **390** L57.
- [27] Stewart J.M., 1990. Class. Quantum Grav. **7**, 1169.
- [28] Woszczyna A., 1992. Phys. Rev. D **45**, 1982.
- [29] Woszczyna A. & Kulak A., 1989. Class. Quantum Grav. **6**, 1665.
- [30] Woszczyna A., Kulak A. & Zieba S., 1991. Class. Quantum Grav. **8**, L167.